REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 4, 2005, has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application as amended is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Office Action and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully solicited in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

At the outset, the Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy extended by the Examiner during the telephone interview of June 16, 2005. During the telephone interview, the arguments set forth below were discussed. The Examiner indicated that he would remove *Lanzy et al* as a reference, update the search, and, if no more pertinent prior art came to light, allow the present application.

The Applicants further acknowledge with appreciation that the previous ground of rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Patel et al* has been reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present Amendment overcomes the objection to the title by making the title indicative of the claimed invention.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Patel et al* in view of *Lanzy et al.*

In the present claimed invention, the server communicates with the provider over the second connection to retrieve the content to be accessed by the user without disclosing identifying information about the user to the provider. That is, the content goes from the provider to the user by way of the server. The present claimed invention offers an advantage in terms of anonymity. To the provider, it appears as though the server, rather than the user, is retrieving the content.

The Office Action acknowledges that *Patel et al* does not explicitly teach a system in which

the server resides between the provider and the user to establish a communication link to the remote provider and retrieve, anonymously, the user-requested data. Instead, the Office Action cites *Lanzy et al* for teaching to provide a server which "resides between an application server and a user to anonymously retrieve data for the client...."

In response, the Applicants respectfully submit that *Lanzy et al* teaches or suggests no such thing. In *Lanzy et al,* the client 110 seeks to access files on the server 120. The server 120 grants or denies access under the control of exit programs 100. That is described in the reference in column 2, lines 20-40. In other words, in *Lanzy et al,* the client 110 retrieves data from the server 120 (shown in the middle of Figure 1 of the reference). Element 100 is simply a pair of exit programs which control the operation of the server 120. At no time does the client 110 retrieve data from the exit programs 100, either through the server 120 or otherwise.

Also, in the reference, there is no server between the client 110 and the server 120 to retrieve data anonymously from the server 120. The server 120 does not establish the first connection to the user and the second connection to a provider to access the content, as called for in the present claims. Instead, the server 120 of the reference *is* the provider of the data sought by the client 110.

As a result, the combination of references proposed in the Office Action would not have resulted in, taught, suggested, or motivated the present claimed invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present claimed invention would not have been obvious over that combination of references.

While the above arguments are deemed sufficient to overcome all outstanding grounds of rejection, the following arguments with regard to specific claims are submitted for the sake of completeness.

With regard to claim 2, the Office Action alleges that the cache memory 108 of the computer

system 100 of the applied reference meets that limitation. However, as explained above, the computer system 100 of the applied reference does not participate in the retrieval of the content to be accessed. Thus, the content to be accessed never reaches the cache memory 108 and is consequently not stored therein. Instead, in the applied reference, the cache memory 108 merely stores data signals for execution by the processor 102. Accordingly, claim 2 is not anticipated.

With regard to claim 3, the applied reference neither teaches nor remotely suggests reformatting a link as called for in the claim. The Office Action cites paragraph [0034] of the reference for that teaching. However, that paragraph is silent on the subject, but merely indicates circumstances in which an anonymous certificate might be desired.

Similarly, with regard to claim 4, paragraph [0035] of the applied reference does not teach or suggest a modified link for accessing the further content through a server, but instead merely describes the generation of an anonymous certificate. Thus, claims 3 and 4 are not anticipated.

Regarding the account maintained for the user in the database in claim 6 and the account maintained for the provider in the database in claim 7, the applied reference is silent on those matters. While paragraph [0034] of the applied reference mentions electronic funds transfer, the system taught in the applied reference does not teach or suggest that the database maintains accounts for doing so. Instead, the only involvement that the system of the applied reference has in the payment is to reveal the identity of a buyer in case of default. Thus, claims 6 and 7 are not anticipated.

Regarding the preset amount of content in claim 11, the Office Action cites paragraphs [0033]-[0034] of the applied reference. However, the Applicants do not see what those paragraphs have to do with a preset amount of content. Instead, those paragraphs concern restrictions on access by citizenship or permanent residence, age of majority, and ability to pay, all of which are entirely

separate from a preset amount of content. Thus, claim 11 is not anticipated.

Finally, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Patel et al* in view of *Lanzy et al* and further in view of *Toader et al*. Since *Toader et al* does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of *Patel et al,* the combination of references proposed in the Office Action would not have resulted in or otherwise rendered obvious the subject matter of claim 5.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application as amended is in condition for allowance. Notice of such allowance is earnestly solicited.

If there remain any issues that can be overcome most easily through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Please charge any deficiency in fees, or credit any overpayment thereof, to BLANK ROME LLP, Deposit Account No. 23-2185 (109246.00103). If an extension of time is required to render this Amendment timely and either is not filed concurrently herewith or is insufficient to render this Amendment timely, the Applicants hereby petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for such an extension for as many months as are required to render this Amendment timely. Any fee due is authorized above.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary KEORKUNIAN et al

By:
David J. Edmondson
Reg. No. 35,126

BLANK ROME LLP
600 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20037-2485
(202) 772-5838 (Telephone)
(202) 572-1438 (Facsimile)